

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS ✓
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Problem Image Mailbox.**

## Marked Examiner's Communication

Unit: 2817

This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

**In the Specification:**

**Remark 1** The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the replacement paragraph to page 8, paragraph 2, note that it is unclear if added reference label "39" is appropriate to designate "signals". In the replacement paragraph bridging pages 10 & 11, note that --as shown in Fig. 3(c)-- should follow "(56)", --adapter-- should precede "(51)" & "(51)" at each appropriate occurrence and --as shown in Fig. 3(a)-- should follow "conductive housing" for clarity of description. In the replacement paragraph bridging pages 14 & 15, note that --4-- should precede "(d)" for clarity of description. Appropriate correction is required.

**Remark 2****Remark 3**

**Remark 4** The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Note that the following reference labels need explicit description relative to the corresponding drawing figures:

Fig. 1(b) (48, E-field); fig. 1(c), (15, 16, 30); Fig. 3(a), (E-field); fig. 4(d), (40). Moreover, at

**Remark 5** pages 11-13, regarding the description of Figs. 3(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), note that the reference labels therein need to be explicitly described relative to the drawing figure(s) in which they actually appear for consistency of description. Appropriate correction is required.

**In the Drawings:**

**Remark 6** The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the universal launching adapter (e.g. 51, 51') being mounted to the major wall of the housing such that the L-shape probe is at a central region (e.g. cl 1) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new

Art Unit: 2817

*Remark 7*

matter should be entered. It should be noted that what the examiner is seeking from this drawing objection is the placement of the adapter of figs. 3(b) or 3(d) and the waveguide of fig. 3(c) arranged relative to the L-shape probe in Fig. 3(a). Such a depiction may be made by phantom views of the adapter and waveguide or exploded views of the adapter and waveguide in fig. 3(a)

*Remark 8*

The drawings are objected to under 37 CAR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the platform for mounting the MMIC & control components in a reference plane parallel to the broad wall as recited in claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

**In the Claims:***Remark 9*

The following claims have been found objectionable for reasons set forth below:


In claim 1, second paragraph, note that "wall each" should be rephrased as --wall, each feedthrough-- for a proper characterization; third paragraph, note that --at least one-- should precede "feedthrough" for consistency of description. Fourth paragraph, note that the bracketed wording is not appropriate to designate deleted words. Clarification is needed.

In claim 8, line 2, note that "n" should be deleted.

*Remark 10***In the Abstract:**

Art Unit: 2817

Remark 11

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the proposed abstract is not in the form of a single sheet which can be insertable in the current application. Moreover, the underlined version of the proposed abstract is inappropriate. A clean copy of the abstract on a single insertable sheet should be provided. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b). 

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

Claims 1-6, 8-10 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benny Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308 4902.



BENNY T LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2817

B. Lee

November 5, 2003

